



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,855	07/01/2005	Minoru Yamamoto	122383	5238
25944	7590	05/10/2007		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER MCCLAIN, GERALD	
			ART UNIT 3653	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/10/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/522,855

Applicant(s)

YAMAMOTO ET AL.

Examiner

Gerald W. McClain

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3 October 2005.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to **150** words; there are **161 words** (not including numbers in parentheses). It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The following title is suggested: Paper Package Inserted Into Sheet Storage Unit Into Position With Side Parts.

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 16, and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: in line 11, "having" should be "has". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 23, "so that" should be formalized to "such that". Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 6 and 10 are objected to because of the following informalities: the phrasing of each claim is not clear. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: in line 6, "removal of" to "removing". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 3653

In Claims, 1 (in line 10), 16 and 17, it is unclear what the phrase "spreading in parallel" means. The specification does not clearly define the phrase and the drawings are not referenced for a definition of the phrase.

In Claims, 1 (in line 11), 16 and 17, it is unclear what "its" is.

The term "proper position" in claims 1, 16, and 17 is a relative term which renders the claims indefinite. The term "proper position" is not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

In Claims, 1 (in line 13), 16 and 17, it is unclear to what the phrase "in regard to" refers and if it means "relative to".

In Claims, 1 (in line 13), 16 and 17, it is unclear who is "letting" structure interact.

In Claim 3, line 23, it is unclear what structure ("uncut part") is cut or not cut and who is cutting it.

In Claim 6, line 5, it is unclear to what "side part" is referred ("side part" of the "package member"?).

In Claims 6 and 10, the overall phrasing of each claim is unclear and should be revised.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3653

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 9, and 15-17, as understood by the Examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Moser (US 4,494,746).

Claims 1 and 16-17: package member (1); sheet package (1); printer (abstract; a copying machine *inherently* has a printer element); side part (1 along which 6 is part); edge (6); sheet storage unit (7); projecting part (3);


Claims 2 and 3: package member (1); perforated line (See Fig. 5 below, line A); side part into two parts (8 and 10 sections); (Note: the method of making an apparatus structure is not considered in apparatus claims.)

Claim 4: projecting part (3); sheet storage unit (7); pressing member (3);

Claim 5: pressing member (3); concave part (17 and 18; Note: the part detail is not shown. However, any cut is *inherently* concave at some point on its profile.); side wall of the sheet storage unit (7); side part (8 and 10); pushing member (4 and 11);

Claim 9: projecting part (3); level difference (See Fig. 1 below, B level; Note: B is "formed in" 7 since B passes through 7.); side wall of the sheet storage unit (7); side part (1 along which 6 is part);

Claim 15: sheet package (1); paper (column 3, lines 5-6; Note: cardboard contains paper);



Claims 1 and 16-17: package member (10); sheet package (10); printer (abstract); side part (23 and 25); edge (23 and 25; See FIG. 6 below, note that the front sections are identified in regions.); sheet storage unit (40); projecting part (55);

Claims 2 and 3: package member (10); perforated line (23 and 25, Note: 23 and 25 were are *capable of* being provided with perforated lines to cut them); side part into two parts (23 and 25); (Note: the method of making an apparatus structure is not considered in apparatus claims.)

Claim 4: projecting part (55); sheet storage unit (40); pressing member (55; Note: every action has an equal and opposite reaction. Therefore, 55 presses the stack of sheets when they press 55.);


Claim 9: projecting part (55); level difference (See FIG. 6, 50 and 52); side wall of the sheet storage unit (55 at 40); side part (23 and 25);

Claim 13: sheet package (10); single sheet-like member (paragraph [0069]);

Claim 14: sheet package (10); fold-back part (11h); (Note: the method of making an apparatus structure is not considered in apparatus claims.)

Claim 15: sheet package (10); paper (paragraph [0069]);

FIG. 6



Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser in view of Ishiduka, et al. (US 6,217,019) ("Ishiduka"). Moser discloses all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. Moser does not directly show a sensor

Art Unit: 3653

provided to the sheet storage unit, or a difference between a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line and a distance from the pressing member to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction is smaller than a maximum permissible displacement of the mark for the sensor wherein the mark indicates the type of the stack of sheets.

Ishiduka shows a similar device having a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, or a difference between a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line and a distance from the pressing member to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction is smaller than a maximum permissible displacement of the mark for the sensor wherein the mark indicates the type of the stack of sheets (column 6, lines 17-32; FIG. 1 and 3A) for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark (column 6, lines 22-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Moser as taught by Ishiduka and include Ishiduka's similar device having a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, or a difference between a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line and a distance from the pressing member to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction is smaller than a maximum permissible displacement of the mark for the sensor wherein the mark indicates the type of the stack of sheets for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark.

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Ishiduka, et al. (US 6,217,019) ("Ishiduka"). Sasaki discloses all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. Sasaki does not directly show a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, or a difference between a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line and a distance from the pressing member to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction is smaller than a maximum permissible displacement of the mark for the sensor wherein the mark indicates the type of the stack of sheets.

Ishiduka shows a similar device having a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, or a difference between a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line and a distance from the pressing member to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction is smaller than a maximum permissible displacement of the mark for the sensor wherein the mark indicates the type of the stack of sheets (column 6, lines 17-32; FIG. 1 and 3A) for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark (column 6, lines 22-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Sasaki as taught by Ishiduka and include Ishiduka's similar device having a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, or a difference between a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line and a distance from the pressing member to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction is smaller than a maximum permissible displacement of the mark for the sensor wherein

the mark indicates the type of the stack of sheets for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moser in view of Ishiduka, et al. (US 6,217,019) ("Ishiduka"). Moser discloses all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. Moser does not directly show a package member provided with a mark which can be read by a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, or a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line that is substantially equal to a distance from the level difference to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction.

Ishiduka shows a similar device having a package member provided with a mark which can be read by a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, and a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line that is substantially equal to a distance from the level difference to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction (column 6, lines 17-32; FIG. 1 and 3A) for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark (column 6, lines 22-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Moser as taught by Ishiduka and include Ishiduka's similar device having a package member provided with a mark which can be read by a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, and a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the

perforated line that is substantially equal to a distance from the level difference to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Ishiduka, et al. (US 6,217,019) ("Ishiduka"). Sasaki discloses all the limitations of the claims as discussed above. Sasaki does not directly show a package member provided with a mark which can be read by a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, or a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line that is substantially equal to a distance from the level difference to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction.

Ishiduka shows a similar device having a package member provided with a mark which can be read by a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, and a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line that is substantially equal to a distance from the level difference to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction (column 6, lines 17-32; FIG. 1 and 3A) for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark (column 6, lines 22-23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to modify Sasaki as taught by Ishiduka and include Ishiduka's similar device having a package member provided with a mark

Art Unit: 3653

which can be read by a sensor provided to the sheet storage unit, and a length of the side part in the sheet feed direction after the removal of the one of the two parts at the perforated line that is substantially equal to a distance from the level difference to a rear wall of the sheet storage unit in the sheet feed direction for the purpose of allowing the printer to read the paper information from the mark.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gerald W. McClain whose telephone number is (571) 272-7803. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick H. Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 3653

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Gerald W. McClain
Examiner
Art Unit 3653



PATRICK MACKEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600